

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/722,768	11/28/2003	Tony Marshall		7213
7590 10/01/2004		,	EXAMINER	
Tony Marshall			GRAHAM, MARK S	
260 Henley Driv Christiansburg,			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
g,			3711	

DATE MAILED: 10/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/722,768	MARSHALL, TONY				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Mark S. Graham	3711				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	_•					
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
<ul> <li>4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.</li> <li>5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.</li> <li>6) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.</li> <li>7) Claim(s) 23 and 24 is/are objected to.</li> </ul>						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.  Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the original transfer of the correction of the original transfer of the correction of the correction of the original transfer of the correction of the corre	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>						
Attachment(s)						
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)</li> <li>Paper No(s)/Mail Date</li> </ol>	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:					

Art Unit: 3711

Claims 5, 23, and 24 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim must refer back in the alternative only. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims 5, 23, and 24 have not been further treated on the merits.

Claims 1-4 and 6-22 are rejected as failing to define the invention in the manner required by 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

The claim(s) are narrative in form and replete with indefinite and functional or operational language. The structure which goes to make up the device must be clearly and positively specified. The structure must be organized and correlated in such a manner as to present a complete operative device. The claim(s) must be in one sentence form only. Note the format of the claims in the patent(s) cited.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4 and 6-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilk in view of Shirley. Wilk is representative of a typical golf course in that it has multiple holes with varied topography and clubhouse facilities. Thus it reads on the claimed invention as best it can be understood with the exception of a kiosk at each hole for providing information to the golfer. However, as disclosed by Shirley it is known in the art to provide such a kiosk each golf

Application/Control Number: 10/722,768

Art Unit: 3711

Page 3

hole to give the golfer information. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have done the same on Wilk's course. How the course is used is not at issue.

Regarding the other recited features of the claims, the examiner takes official notice that varied topography, obstacles, and multiple buildings are all commonly known on golf courses and would have been obvious on Wilk's course.

Concerning multiple green colors, the color or the green varies depending on its exposure and degree of water intake from brown to various shades of green.

With regard to the disc golf target, standard golf flags in their respective holes meet the limitations of the claims.

Libit et al., Dumas, and Luna have been cited for interest because they disclose similar devices.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Mark S. Graham at Mall hidean telephone number 703-308-1355.

MSG 9/23/04